

February 4, 1992 LB 291

course, and when I have more time I'll be referring to some cases from some other jurisdictions that do this. Remember, the policy could be, I guess if someone wants to do that, we could make this apply to everywhere in the State of Nebraska including out in the middle of the north forty.

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I don't think that that's the best policy either. I'd be most happy to answer questions throughout the morning. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Because of the nature of this bill and to prevent a break in Senator Kristensen's discussion, I would ask unanimous consent to allow him to continue until he fully explains the very extensive amendment, if he's willing to do it. And I ask for unanimous consent, because if anybody objects, naturally, it would mean that I'm the only one probably who would want that explanation.

SPEAKER BAACK: Do you need more time, Senator Kristensen, to....

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take all the time you'll give me, but...

SPEAKER BAACK: Well, I'm not going to give you all you want. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Actually, I'm not sure it's a point of privilege, I think it's a point of the rules. But it seems to me that we have ways informally of doing this without a unanimous consent. I think the rules are pretty clear, and you'll probably have to suspend the rules to do this, or what we normally do, whoever the next light is simply give their time to Senator Kristensen. But I'm not sure that a unanimous consent can, by its operation, basically override existing rules, when they are explicit, as opposed to when they're silent, in which case I think a unanimous consent would be most appropriate. But here we have a logical speaking order with limitations in the rules, and I'm not sure that a unanimous consent can directly override the rules.